

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1-15 were rejected, claim 14 was objected to, and the drawings and declaration was objected to. With this amendment, claims 1, 3, 8-11, and 14 are amended, and claims 7 and 12 are canceled. On the basis of the following remarks, consideration of this application and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Oath/Declaration

The declaration was objected to on the ground that the title of the application as identified in the declaration contained a misspelling. A new declaration is being submitted herewith to correct the misspelling and thereby address this objection.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the examiner identified as claimed but not shown the following features: “at least one computer component,” in claim 8; the “hollow tab configured to fit around a perimeter of the rounded portions of the chassis frame,” in claim 10; the “convex surface on an upwardly facing plane of the frame wherein the convex surface is configured to support a chassis cover,” in claim 12; and the “plurality of drives of different sizes,” in claim 14.

Applicant traverses the objection to the drawings with respect to the “at least one computer component,” recited in claim 8. Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), each of the structural elements or parts of the claimed invention must be shown in the drawings. But in claim 8, “at least one computer component” is not a part of the apparatus being claimed. Rather, this language is used to describe the “removable structure,” which is a component of the claimed apparatus. It is the claimed “removable structure [that] is configured to house at least one

computer component” that must be shown in the drawings, and that structure is shown.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The objection regarding claim 10 has been mooted, as the claim has been amended to recite that the “removable structure includes corresponding rounded portions configured to fit over the rounded portions of the chassis frame.” This feature is shown, e.g., in FIG. 1 of the drawings.

The objection regarding claim 12 has been mooted because that claim is canceled.

Lastly, Applicant also traverses the objection to the drawings with respect to the “plurality of drives of different sizes,” recited in claim 14. As explained above, the drawings must show all structural elements of the claimed invention. Claim 14 does not recite a plurality of drives of different sizes; it recites a removable drive frame that is described, in part, as being able to accommodate drives of different sizes. The thing being claimed — i.e., the removable drive that can support various drives — is shown in the drawings as required by Rule 83(a). Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 14 was objected to for containing a grammatical error. This typographical error has been corrected with this amendment.

Claim Rejections — § 112

Claims 10 and 12 were rejected as not being enabled. These rejections have been mooted by the amendment to claim 10 and the cancellation of claim 12. It is respectfully asserted that claim 10, as amended, is enabled by the specification (see ¶ 16 of the specification).

Claim 3 was rejected as lacking a proper antecedent basis for the recitation of “the rail.” The amendment to claim 3 removes this language and thus overcomes this rejection.

Claim Rejections — Prior Art

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected as made obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,754,071 to Lin et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,053,586 to Cook et al., and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,164,886 to Chang. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations from original dependent claim 7, so claim 1 now recites the same subject matter as in original claim 7. The obviousness rejection of claims 7 and 14 based on the combination of Lin, Cook, and Chang thus applies to current claims 1 and 14. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claims 1 recites, “a removable structure adapted to be installed within the computer chassis, the removable structure configured to fit with at least some of the rounded portions of the chassis frame.” These “rounded portions of the chassis frame” in claim 1 are “on the load-bearing surface” and “support a chassis cover installed on the chassis frame.” Similarly, claim 14 recites, “a removable drive frame . . . comprising interface structures corresponding to each rounded dome, each interface structure configured to fit over each rounded dome.” The “rounded domes” in claim 14 are “formed into the upward facing surfaces of the computer chassis frame and distributed evenly along the surfaces,” thereby supporting a chassis cover. As claimed, therefore, the “rounded portions” of claim 1 and the “rounded domes” of claim 14 have a dual purpose: to support a chassis cover and to secure in place a removable structure. In this way, they provide a distributed means to support the weight of the chassis cover (and objects placed on top of the cover) while also facilitating the easy removal and installation of the removable structure or drive frame.

The cited references fail to suggest this claimed feature. In particular, neither Lin nor Cook disclose a removable structure or drive frame, so Chang was cited for this feature. But while Chang does disclose a removable “holder” for holding disk drives, Chang’s holder does

not fit with any structure that supports a chassis cover. Rather, Chang's holder is secured by hooks (elements 241 and 51), as shown in FIG. 1. As the side view of FIG. 5 clearly shows, Chang's hooks (elements 51, as well as elements 241, which are not visible in this view) are lower than the top flange (element 236). Chang's hooks are therefore not located high enough and thus cannot support a chassis cover (which is shown to be flat in FIG. 1).

Accordingly, there is no suggestion of mounting a removable structure by fitting that removable structure with or over a part of the chassis frame that supports a computer chassis cover. At best, the claimed combination would only achieve mounting a removable structure to an interface that does not also support the chassis cover (e.g., the "hooks" in Chang). But this would fail to achieve the dual purpose of the interface that is achieved by the claimed invention, thereby increasing the manufacturing complexity and material cost because additional parts would be needed to perform both functions. Because a suggestion for this claimed feature is absent, claims 1 and 14 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-6, 8-11, and 15 depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable over the proposed combination of Lin, Cook, and Chang for the reasons provided above.

Additionally, claims 14 and dependent claim 10 further recite that the removable structure includes corresponding "rounded portions" or "interface structures" that fit over the rounded portions or domes of the chassis frame. As seen in the side view of Chang's FIG. 5, the holder (element 6) slides underneath the hooks (elements 51, as well as elements 241, which are not visible in this view) and is secured under the hooks and a corresponding structure (either "cross bar" 5 for hooks 51 or "fixed holder" 24 for hooks 241). This results in a different assembly of the removable structure altogether — and one that is more difficult. Therefore, the references fail to suggest a removable structure that fits over the rounded portions or domes of

the chassis frame that support a chassis cover. Claims 10 and 14 are therefore patentable over the proposed combination for this additional reason.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite a removable structure that fits over a means for supporting the chassis cover. Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 13, as amended, is patentable over the combination of Lin, Cook, and Chang for the reasons stated above.

Summary

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the examiner believes for any reason direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,
STAN CHENG

Dated: February 1, 2006

By: Robert A. Hulse

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2444
Fax: (415) 281-1350